



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,082	01/02/2002	Herman Fischer	36584-6050	8788

7590 10/20/2004

Mobile WebSurf.com, Inc.
42808 Christy Street
Suite 100
Fremont, CA 94538

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/038,082	FISCHER, HERMAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cong-Lac Huynh	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: the application filed on 1/2/02, priority filed 1/3/01.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 19, 21, 22, 24 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piven, *WAP: New Web Whopper*, Computer Technology Review, September 1999, vol. 19, iss. 9, pg. 1, 3pgs (printed from ProQuest as pages 1-4), in view of Angelucci et al. (US Pat No. 6,185,573 B1, 2/6/01, filed 4/22/98).

Regarding independent claim 1, Piven discloses:

- receiving a copy of the Web document, (**page 3, 3rd paragraph**: the web page content is received to be displayed on handheld devices)
- dividing the Web document into a series of two or more subdocuments (**page 3, 3rd paragraph**: "... Because HTML pages are often long documents that require scrolling, WML displays documents and content in ways that make them more

accessible to mobile users on small devices. One such method is via a “card” metaphor, which basically breaks pages into single-screen views that can be accessed and reordered (or shuffled) like filecards, using a scroll button on the handheld device...”; the fact that a long Web document is broken into single-screen pages accessible by users using a scroll button on the handheld device shows that the Web document is divided into two or more subdocuments)

- sending a first subdocument in the series of subdocuments to the user device, **(page 3, 3rd paragraph: “... Because HTML pages are often long documents that require scrolling, WML displays documents and content in ways that make them more accessible to mobile users on small devices. One such method is via a “card” metaphor, which basically breaks pages into single-screen views that can be accessed and reordered (or shuffled) like filecards, using a scroll button on the handheld device...”; the fact that users can access the web document in handheld devices via the single-screen views shows that each single-screen view, which is equivalent to a subdocument, in a series of single-screen views from the web document is sent to the user device)**

Piven does not disclose that the web document includes one or more data entry fields for receiving data, and the subdocuments divided from the Web document include the data entry fields from the Web document.

Angelucci discloses a Web document including one or more data entry fields for receiving data from users (figures 3a-b, col 4, lines 25-37, col 8, lines 14-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Angelucci into Piven for the following reason. Angelucci discloses a Web documents that include one or more data entry fields for receiving data from users providing the advantage to incorporate into Piven for displaying a web document with data entry fields in the single-screen pages according to the size of the screen since the HTML form document with data entry fields in Angelucci is merely a Web document, and thus motivating to be broken into single-screen pages for viewing in user devices.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Piven discloses:

- receiving a request from the user device for a second subdocument in a series of subdocuments (**page 3, 3rd paragraph**: the fact that Piven allows each single-screen page broken from the HTML document to be *navigated with a touch of a single button* implies that a request from a user device is received for a single-screen page in a series of single-screen pages)

Piven and Angelucci do not explicitly disclose:

- receiving a first data set comprised of data from the data entry fields in the first subdocument
- storing the first data set in a data store
- sending the second subdocument to the user device, the second document including one or more data entry fields form the Web document

- receiving a data submission request from the user device, the data submission request including a second data set comprised of data from the data fields in the second subdocument
- retrieving the first data set from the data store
- sending the first data set and the second data set to a node of the computer network

Instead, Angelucci discloses:

- filling data into the fields of the forms (figures 3a-b, col 7, lines 58-67, col 8, lines 14-67)
- storing the text input data in the form fields in the database (col 7, lines 58-67)
- sending the entered data to the fields of the web form to a node of the computer network (col 3, lines 57-65: the input text when stored in the central file can be transmitted to the remote location according to the search criteria)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Angelucci into Piven for the following reason. Angelucci teaches receiving data input to the fields and storing said data in a database providing the advantage to incorporate into Piven for receiving the data entered to the data entry fields of *each subdocument* as well as storing the entered data of *each subdocument* in a data store where the subdocument can be a first or a second subdocument depending on the order of the request. Also, the fact that a HTML document in Piven can be divided into the subdocuments motivates to divide the web form document in Angelucci

into subdocuments including data entry fields from the Web document since a web form document is basically a HTML document.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Piven and Angelucci disclose that the Web document is written in a markup language (Piven: page 3; Angelucci: col 4, lines 25-37, figures 3a-b).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Piven and Angelucci disclose that the markup language comprises HyperText Markup Language (HTML) (Piven: page 3; Angelucci: col 4, lines 25-37, figures 3a-b).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 3, Piven and Angelucci does not disclose explicitly reviewing one or more tags in the Web document to determine whether the Web document is a Web form document.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated into Piven and Angelucci the step of reviewing one or more tags in the Web document to determine whether the Web document is a Web form document since it was well known that the form in a HTML document is written by the FORM tags in HTML codes. Therefore, a web document including a form must have the form tags in the source codes of the web document where the form tags are data for easily determining the form feature of a web document.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Piven discloses:

- receiving data that describes the capabilities of the user devices (**page 3, 3rd paragraph:** *"... Because HTML pages are often long documents that require scrolling, WML displays documents and content in ways that make them more accessible to mobile users on small devices. One such method is via a "card" metaphor, which basically breaks pages into single-screen views that can be accessed and reordered (or shuffled) like filecards, using a scroll button on the handheld device..."*; the fact that a long Web document is *broken in single-screen views* implies that the data of capabilities of the user device is received so that the long web document is broken into the pages of the screen size of the user device)
- considering the capabilities of the user devices when dividing the Web document into a series of two or more subdocuments (**page 3, 3rd paragraph:** as mentioned above, the capabilities of the user device is considered so that the long web document is broken into the pages of the size of the user device's screen)

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Piven discloses receiving information descriptive of the size of the display screen of the user device (page 3, 3rd paragraph: the fact that the long web document is broken into pages having the size of the screen of the user device implies that the information descriptive the size of the display screen of the user device is received to perform such a page break).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Piven discloses that the subdocuments are each sized to fit within the display screen of the user device (**page 3, 3rd paragraph**: "... *Because HTML pages are often long documents that require scrolling, WML displays documents and content in ways that make them more accessible to mobile users on small devices. One such method is via a "card" metaphor, which basically breaks pages into single-screen views that can be accessed and reordered (or shuffled) like filecards, using a scroll button on the handheld device...*").

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Piven does not disclose that one or more data entry fields in the web document for receiving data include a field for receiving textual data.

Angelucci discloses that one or more data entry fields for receiving data include a field for receiving textual data (figures 3a-b: field First Name has textual data).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Angelucci into Piven since Angelucci discloses the data received in the data entry fields are textual data where said fields are included in a web document providing the advantage to incorporate into the web document of Piven for receiving textual data to the entry fields since a form with entry fields is a typical element of a web document.

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Piven does not disclose that one or more entry fields for receiving data include a drop-down menu.

Angelucci discloses that one or more data entry fields for receiving data include a drop-down menu (figures 3a-b: field State is a drop-down menu).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Angelucci into Piven since Angelucci discloses that one or more data entry fields for receiving data is a drop-down menu where said fields are included in a web document providing the advantage to incorporate into the web document of Piven for including a drop-down menu format to the entry fields since a form with entry fields is a typical element of a web document, and having an entry field with a drop-down menu in a web document would facilitate the filling process and save time for a user since everything is ready for a user to choose for filling without thinking and typing.

Regarding independent claim 11, Piven discloses:

- receiving a copy of the Web document, (**page 3, 3rd paragraph**: the web page content is received for displaying on handheld devices)
- dividing the Web document into a series of two or more subdocuments (**page 3, 3rd paragraph**: "... Because HTML pages are often long documents that require scrolling, WML displays documents and content in ways that make them more accessible to mobile users on small devices. One such method is via a "card" metaphor, which basically breaks pages into single-screen views that can be

Art Unit: 2178

- accessed and reordered (or shuffled) like filecards, using a scroll button on the handheld device..."; the fact that the long Web documents are broken in single-screen views accessible by users using a scroll button on the handheld device shows that the Web documents are divided into two or more subdocuments)*
- sending a first subdocument in the series of subdocuments to the user device, **(page 3, 3rd paragraph: "... Because HTML pages are often long documents that require scrolling, WML displays documents and content in ways that make them more accessible to mobile users on small devices. One such method is via a "card" metaphor, which basically breaks pages into single-screen views that can be accessed and reordered (or shuffled) like filecards, using a scroll button on the handheld device..."; the fact that users can access the web documents in handheld devices via the single-screen views shows that the single-screen views which are subdocuments from the web documents are sent to user devices)**
 - receiving a request from the user device for a second subdocument in a series of subdocuments **(page 3, 3rd paragraph: the fact that Piven allows each single-screen page broken from the HTML document to be *navigated with a touch of a single button* implies that a request from a user device is received for a single-screen page in a series of single-screen pages)**

Piven does not disclose that the web documents include one or more data entry fields for receiving data, and the subdocuments divided from the Web document include the data entry fields from the Web document.

Art Unit: 2178

Angelucci discloses the Web document including one or more data entry fields for receiving data from users (figures 3a-b, col 4, lines 25-37, col 8, lines 14-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Angelucci into Piven for the following reason. Angelucci discloses a Web documents that include one or more data entry fields for receiving data from users providing the advantage to incorporate into Piven since the HTML form document with data entry fields in Angelucci is merely a Web document, and thus, motivating to be broken into single-screen pages for viewing in user devices and receiving data to the fields.

Piven and Angelucci do not explicitly disclose:

- receiving a first data set comprised of data from the data entry fields in the first subdocument
- storing the first data set in a data store
- sending the second subdocument to the user device, the second document including one or more data entry fields form the Web document
- receiving a data submission request from the user device, the data submission request including a second data set comprised of data from the data fields in the second subdocument
- retrieving the first data set from the data store
- sending the first data set and the second data set to a node of the computer network

Instead, Angelucci discloses:

Art Unit: 2178

- filling data into the fields of the forms (figures 3a-b, col 7, lines 58-67, col 8, lines 14-67)
- storing the text input data in the form fields in the database (col 7, lines 58-67)
- sending the entered data to the fields of the web form to a node of the computer network (col 3, lines 57-65: the input text when stored in the central file can be transmitted to the remote location according to the search criteria)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Angelucci into Piven for the following reason. Angelucci teaches receiving data input to the fields and storing said data in a database providing the advantage to incorporate into Piven for receiving the data entered to the data entry fields of *each subdocument* as well as storing the entered data of *each subdocument* in a data store where the subdocument can be a first or a second subdocument depending on the order of the request. Further, sending the entered data to the fields of the web form to a node of the computer network implies that retrieving the stored data is carried out. Also, the fact that a HTML document in Piven can be divided into the subdocuments motivates to divide a web form document in Angelucci into subdocuments including data entry fields from the Web document since a web form document is basically a HTML document.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Piven does not disclose:

- receiving an instruction from the user device to submit data to the server
- transmitting the first set of data to the server

Art Unit: 2178

Angelucci discloses:

- receiving an instruction from the user device to submit data to the server (**col 7, lines 58-65**: processing the fill-out forms on a remote client by the text input utility executing on the central server implies that the data after being filled in the fill-out form by a user at user device, are submitted to the server via a conventional way as pressing a submit button)
- transmitting the first set of data to the server (**col 7, lines 58-65**: processing the fill-out forms on a remote client by the text input utility executing on the central server implies that the filled data is submitted to the server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Angelucci into Piven since Angelucci discloses transmitting data to the server via a submit instruction from a user device providing the advantage to incorporate into Piven for transmitting data submitted in each screen view of the web document to the server for further processing.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, Piven discloses:

- receiving a request from the user device for a subdocument from the series of subdocuments (page 3, 3rd paragraph: a touch of button for viewing a single-screen page shows a request from the user device is received)

Piven and Angelucci does not disclose:

- determining whether any stored data is associated with the data entry fields in the requested subdocument

- if any stored data is associated with the data entry fields in the requested subdocument, then sending the requested subdocument to the user device including the data that is associated with the data entry fields in the requested subdocument

Instead, Angelucci discloses the form with data entry fields including a drop-down menu for receiving data (figures 3a-b).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Angelucci to include the feature of sending the requested subdocument to the user device with the stored data associated with the data entry fields if a determination that there is store data associated with the data entry fields for the following reason. As seen in figure 3a of Angelucci, field State is a drop-down menu where it was well known that a drop-down menu has stored data for user to select for the associated field. Therefore, it is clear that whenever a form including such field is sent to the user device, the stored data in the drop-down menu is sent along with the form. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Angelucci into Piven for viewing a single-screen page with stored data associated to an entry field in a form via a touch of button to request such a subdocument.

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 11, Piven does not disclose that the series of subdocuments collectively include the data entry fields from the Web document.

Angelucci discloses the Web document including one or more data entry fields for receiving data from users (figures 3a-b, col 4, lines 25-37, col 8, lines 14-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Angelucci into Piven for the following reason. Angelucci discloses a Web document that include one or more data entry fields for receiving data from users providing the advantage to incorporate into Piven since the HTML form document with data entry fields in Angelucci is merely a type of Web document, and thus motivating to be broken into single-screen pages for viewing in user devices.

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 11, Piven and Angelucci disclose that the Web document is written in a markup language (Piven: page 3; Angelucci: col 4, lines 25-37, figures 3a-b).

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Piven and Angelucci disclose that the markup language comprises HyperText Markup Language (HTML) (Piven: page 3; Angelucci: col 4, lines 25-37, figures 3a-b).

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 15, Piven discloses that the subdocuments are written in a markup language that is different from the markup language of the Web document (**page 3, 3rd paragraph**: the web document, which is the HTML pages, is written in HTML, and the pages broken into single-screen size of

Art Unit: 2178

the handheld device, which are equivalent to the subdocuments, are written in WML-wireless markup language).

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 11, Piven discloses that the subdocuments are each sized to fit within a display screen of the user device (**page 3, 3rd paragraph**: the fact that the HTML document is broken into pages of a single-screen size of the handheld device shows that said pages, which are equivalent to the subdocuments, are sized to fit within a display screen of the user device).

Claims 19-20 are for a system of method claims 11-12, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 21 is for a system of method claims 1-2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 22-23 are for a program product of method claims 1-2, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 24-25 are for a program product of method claims 11-13, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kennedy et al. (US Pat No. 6,651,217 B1, 11/18/03, filed 9/1/99).

Bornstein et al. (US Pat No. 6,424,362 B1, 7/23/02, filed 2/1/99).

Shimoosava et al. (US Pat No. 6,459,423 B1, 10/1/02, filed 4/28/99).

Schwerdtfeger et al. (US Pat No. 6,725,424 B1, 4/20/04, filed 12/9/99).

Anderson et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2004/0095400 A1, 5/20/04, filed 11/19/02).

Nakamura (US Pat App Pub No. 2002/0072947 A1, 7/13/02, filed 4/26/01).

Kosaka et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2002/0062213 A1, 5/23/02, filed 11/16/01).

Auffray et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2002/0083154 A1, 6/27/02, filed 12/14/01).

Weinberg et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2002/0122063 A1, 9/5/02, filed 12/29/00).

Shaughnessy et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2003/0028562 A1, 2/6/03, filed 12/29/00).

Pennell et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2002/0013788 A1, 1/31/02, filed 5/18/01).

Kaimowitz (US Pat App Pub No. 2002/0023024 A1, 2/21/02, filed 7/30/01).

Rawat et al. (US Pat No. 6,662,340 B2, 12/9/03, filed 5/30/02, priority 4/28/00).

Horstmann et al. (US Pat No. 6,779,022, 8/17/04, filed 8/17/00).

Bickmore et al., Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users, The Computer Journal, Vol. 42, No. 6, 1999, pages 534-546.

Dorshkind, WAP Untethers the Web, Unix Review's Performance Computing, June 1999, Vol. 17, Iss. 6, pg. 59, 3 pgs.

Harney, The Wireless Internet: Good To Go, Telephony, October 6, 1997, pg. 18, 4 pgs.

Art Unit: 2178

Schwartz, Visual Development Stepping Stones Take Web Sites to Higher Ground,
Computing Canada, June 9, 1997, vol. 23, pg. S6, 1 pgs.


Dobson, Determining the Content and Look of Your Web Pages with Access, Microsoft
Office Developer's Journal, Oct 1998, vol. 2, pg. 6, 6 pgs.

Conallen, Modeling Web Application Architectures with UML, Association for Computing
Machinery, October 1999, vol. 42, pg. 1-9.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-
4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for
the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Cong-Lac Huynh
Examiner
Art Unit 2178
10/14/04